

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
9

10 NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE  
11 COUNCIL, et al.,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

14 KIRK C. RODGERS, etc., et al.,

15 Defendants.  
16 \_\_\_\_\_/

NO. CIV. S-88-1658 LKK

O R D E R

17 The court is in receipt of several motions related to the  
18 filing of amicus briefs in the above-captioned case. The court  
19 addresses each motion in turn.

20 First, on September 25, 2006, the South San Joaquin  
21 Irrigation District, Oakland Irrigation District, Modesto  
22 Irrigation District, Turlock Irrigation District, and Merced  
23 Irrigation District (the "Irrigation Districts") filed a motion  
24 for an extension of time to file their amicus brief by October  
25 13, 2006. Previously, on August 15, 2005, the court granted  
26 leave to file an amicus brief within fifteen days from the  
lodging of a settlement by the parties. The settling parties do

1 not oppose an extension of time but request that the Irrigation  
2 Districts submit their amicus brief by no later than October 6,  
3 2006, which is the day that an opposition to the settling  
4 parties' motion to enter is due.

5 Second, on September 8, 2006, Public Citizens, Bowles  
6 Farming company, Inc., the Nickel Family LLC d/b/a San Juan  
7 Ranch, Wolfsen, Inc., the Forbes, Yore & McGinn Corp. a/k/a  
8 McNamara Farms, and Carolyn Butts (collectively, the "Reach 4B  
9 Landowners") filed a motion for leave to file an amicus brief.  
10 Likewise, on September 14, 2006, the San Joaquin River Exchange  
11 Contractors Water Authority ("Exchange Contractors") filed a  
12 motion for leave to file an amicus brief. Both requested  
13 fifteen days from the lodging of the settlement in which to file  
14 their briefs. On September 15, 2006, the settling parties  
15 responded that they do not oppose either motion in principle.  
16 Subsequently, on September 26, 2006, the Ranch 4B Landowners  
17 filed an amended motion, in which they attached the amici brief  
18 for which they sought leave to file.

19 Finally, on September 26, 2006, the Lower San Joaquin Levee  
20 District ("Levee District") filed a motion for leave to file an  
21 amicus brief. The Levee District also requested fifteen days  
22 from the lodging of the settlement in which to do so.

23 Good cause having been shown, the court orders as follows:

- 24 1. The Irrigation Districts' motion for an extension of  
25 time to file their amicus brief is hereby GRANTED.

26 Amici shall file their brief by October 6, 2006.


2. The Exchange Contractors' motion for leave to file an amicus brief is hereby GRANTED. Amici shall file their brief by October 6, 2006. The hearing set for October 23, 2006, at 10:00 a.m. is VACATED.

3. The Reach 4B Landowners' motion for leave to file an amicus brief is hereby GRANTED. Amici shall file their brief by October 6, 2006. The hearing set for October 10, 2006, at 10:00 a.m. is hereby VACATED.

4. The Levee Districts' motion for leave to file an amicus is hereby GRANTED. Amici shall file their brief by October 6, 2006. The hearing set for October 23, 2006, at 10:00 a.m. is hereby VACATED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: September 27, 2006.

  
LAWRENCE K. KARLTON  
SENIOR JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT